

**Response Page - Looking Back, Thinking Ahead: Strengthening Minnesota's  
Public- Policy Process -**

**These comments are responses to the  
Civic Caucus report of November 27, 2016.**

**Roger Moe**--Great work Civic Caucus!

**Sallie Kemper**--I am happy to endorse the report. Congratulations on such a huge effort. I do hope we will see some fruits of your valiant labor very, very soon!

**John Rollwagen**--Excellent report. I will be very interested to see how it is received in the foundation community itself, and particularly if some one or group of them picks up the ball.

**Mary Vasaly**--Extremely well researched and thoughtful

**Joe Vene**--Carry on. Yours is an urgent mission in apprising the masses in matters of public policy.

**Dick McFarland**--A great piece of work. I would be proud to have my signature attached.

**Russell A. Anderson**--Great job! Great report!

**Dennis Carlson**--I fully endorse this well done report. Extensive research and thoughtful conversations have taken place over a long period of time to create it. Our task now is to put these ideas into practice. I look forward to seeing the results of this excellent work.

**Steve Anderson**--This is an excellent report, and I would be proud to add my name to it.

**Kitty Gogins**--The Civic Caucus report addresses our need to develop creative, fact-based solutions to our pressing public-policy challenges using a thoughtful, civil, and inclusive process. (If you want a descriptor of who we are, I serve on the Roseville Area School Board and Chair the Equity Alliance MN Board and the International Institute of Minnesota Board)

**Terry Stone**--There is a reason government seems suddenly inept. Our current form of government was designed to accommodate humanity that needed to live in cities whose concentrations of resources (labor, knowledge, transportation, capital) were needed to foster and maintain industrialization. This form of government has served us pretty well. Automation and the internet are rapidly decentralizing the resources needed to maintain industrialization. Knowledge is now available nearly anywhere and the need for a centralized large labor force is diminishing. The form of government that evolved to foster and maintain the classic model of industrialization is starting to prove cumbersome and ineffective as seen by gridlock and acrimony at various levels of government.

Tribal government gave way to feudal government as agriculture grew to support cities. Then feudal government gave way to representative democracies as the needs of industrialized society arose. A third evolutionary spurt in governmental morphology is upon us. Now we will see the form of government evolve to meet the needs of less centralized knowledge, labor, transportation and capital. It will have to evolve, the people demand it and current government structure is largely nonresponsive. No one has figured this out yet; we are at the stage where

few like government (approval ratings are abysmal) but we don't know yet why or what to do about it.

This is important because anyone involved in long term planning will be buffeted by likely disruptive evolution in government. Some thought to how this evolution will take place to better serve post-industrial societal structure seems time well spent. Perhaps we can be the first to avail ourselves of new trends in getting things done. Whether the evolution in government will take a hundred years or whether it is already underway is hard to tell, but evolve it will. Trump may even be the product of a need for government to evolve.

**Jan Hively**--It is an honor to sign on to your excellent report

**Dwight Johnson**--Great job! I know that the team has worked very hard.

**Alan Kantrud**--I was smart enough to follow you, early-on, in my bid for elective office and remain committed to your cause. I tried to sell the purple-caucus too in my time in the spotlight but alas my District got caught in the Trump-Clinton sandwich as did so many others. I really think and know that I was the voice of reason and compromise in my District (39B) but there was such an entrenched person as the incumbent that it was a tough row to hoe either way.

Please count me in on anything I can do to advance your goals and keep the conversations going. I really enjoy your interviews and even edited one!

Cheers, and thanks, Keep it up,

**Tim McDonald**--Now more than ever there is opportunity (and need) for objective analysis and civic discussion aimed at developing solutions to problems. The definitions of policy design and action are helpful -- two related processes. It seems that leadership is a key element to successful policy development and implementation taking this approach.

**Arvonne Fraser**--Sorry. I don't agree with your conclusions. Your group is too top down, too urban, too non-partisan and too anti-advocacy. While I agree there is a role for something like a civic caucus, your group is far too small and monolithic to represent MN. And I don't agree that we should be educating for jobs almost exclusively. Education for citizenship, however, has been sadly neglected by both parties and by non-partisan groups for far too long. Perhaps I'm too political for you but politics is the art and science of government so it should not be ignored or maligned.

**David Broden**--I will add a bit of commentary on how the report is a stage setter and a nibble perhaps big bite of the action required. I remain an advocate that the need extends strongly and perhaps immediately to the process as to how the ideas are evolved and how citizens of all segments and across all of MN are involved. The report is a strong endorsement to continue to address the total framework of public policy for today and the future.

**Sheldon Clay**--I'm still digesting the entirety of the report, but I like the idea of asking the philanthropic community for ideas as well as funding a lot. Let's hope all the work you've put into this does some good.

**Dane Smith**--I'm so thankful for you and others upholding these finest civic traditions of MN.

**David A. Schultz**--I might have taken an entirely different approach to the policy process but I am not opposed to this.

**D. T. King**--This is an essential report, and I support it.

**Laura H. Gilbert**--Thanks. Great work - as usual :)

**Paul Hauge**--An exhaustive report- I didn't read all of it but destined to have an important impact on our area.

**Lynn Gitelis**--While I think this is a good approach, several recent experiences with "funders" leaves me wondering about whether I am comfortable with that idea these days. They seem to have adopted the "run non-profit work as a business" mantra, without any apparent understanding that you cannot measure how many people are no longer poor because you provided free dinners. Very unrealistic expectations seem to be invading the non-profit space.

I also think you may be underselling yourselves; you said: "Disinterested outsiders are critically needed, but are often overlooked and might lack a sense of their own potential". It seems to me that Civic Caucus could serve as an arbitrator/mediator in some of these policy development projects. You certainly have the expertise and the "disinterested 3rd party" status that is required for that role. That could be a significant value/added to remedying this logjam.

**Marina Lyon**--Yes, absolutely you may add my name to the report. Thanks to you and everyone's hard work on the report, there will be a chance at some real change. If you need help selling the report or to others, please let me know. While I'm working from home, it's really busy, but I will do my best to assist with the follow-up to the report, in whatever capacity you request.

**Lars Esdal**--I read the Look Back, Thinking Ahead (LBTA) report over the weekend. I would like to enthusiastically add my signature. It is both well done and well written. Who was the lead author on the report?

I think you will find interesting and relevant the attached, which is a short case study I wrote back in 2014, on the Bottom Line redesign initiative 2009 through 2012. I wrote it while in grad school, for my course on philanthropy. I was charged to investigate and evaluate a foundation's major initiative; I chose Bush Foundation + Bottom Line.

Jeff Zlonis (who I've copied here) was one of my main sources on the case study, and so I defer to him if I've erred in any of the facts, findings (or conclusions) herein. Please don't circulate this case study, as I use real names and never really wrote it for public distribution.

In reflecting both on what you wrote in LBTA and what I wrote in this case study (and in reflecting on my own experiences working on redesign in Minnesota over the last two years post-grad school) I think there is a point which is under-emphasized in both. Both focus on the policy proposal as the key unit of action. I think both under emphasize the role of the institutional policy messenger.

You are very convincing in LBTA as to why you aim your recommendations at asking philanthropy to solicit policy proposals, rather than asking policy organizations to do redesign work. I don't disagree with your reasoning—but I think philanthropy must *a/so*, and separately, invest in building institutions with redesign at their core mission.

The two are distinct. Policy organizations need to build their reputation, reach, and capacity through, as Loritz often says, both transactional leadership *and* transformational leadership. Citizens League practiced transactional leadership through its publications, events, and other programming. When you reflect back on the Citizens League in this report I think you underestimate its enormous strength as an institution—with its visibility, connections, brand, track record—and how closely that was linked to its success with specific policy proposals.

You need strong institutions also because, as Kolderie points out, big policy changes often take time. They require playing "outside game" for often many years, going back to the legislature again and again. Putting too much emphasis on "the proposal" as the unit of change I fear opens up for disappointment on behalf of foundations when they don't see change in a year or two. If they invest only in the proposals themselves, or even a proposal plus an advocacy campaign, and not in building reputation and capacity of the organizations who continue carrying them, they may become disillusioned with the whole redesign concept.

This is, I believe, what happened with Bottom Line; it was highly proposal-focused, not at all institution-focused.

I'm curious as to your thoughts on this observation. I don't mean this to be a criticism of what you've written—which is excellent—I only mean it to say investing in redesign institutions themselves is a separate and important priority.

**Melissa Stone**--I read the report which offers important and insightful recommendations for policy design processes. I am happy to add my name to the list of supporters and wish the Civic Caucus all the best in pushing forward these ideas. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with the group.

**Bill Rudelius**--Why would any person with a good job in a foundation, university, or legislature want to change?

My simple-minded answer: They won't--unless driven personally by greed or fear! I used to think there was a third reason--"to do what is right and makes the world better." But that thought ended with my Boy Scout years.

This feeling is biased by my losing 25-year effort to get large public universities back in the business of delivering high-quality undergraduate education.

My limited experience is that *greed* generally doesn't work because the people controlling the purse-strings will likely be working against their own interests.

So that takes me to giving *fear* a try--in our Civic Caucus case by pushing the media to inform the public more aggressively what policies are working and not working to force change for the better.

**Ray Lewis**--I shared this email with the 100 Million Healthier Lives implementation director as an example of the process of making policy.

**Craig Peterson**--I am quite impressed and encouraged by this report and would be happy to sign as a supporter.

**Jan Ormasa--** Thanks for sending out this report. I so appreciate the thoughtfulness.

**Marina Lyon--**Love the report and release (especially "it's not ok to put special interests in a room and let them duke it out." I sure hope it gets good coverage and follow-up from the press. So many good and obvious points/recommendations. Hopefully, we can all wake up and start moving forward. With the incoming president, state leadership on all kinds of issues is needed more than at any other time during my 38 years in Minnesota.

Thank you, thank you, thank you -- to you and all the Civic Caucus members who spent a lot of time, energy and thought on this very important issue.

**Carole M. Faricy--**Great work!

**Gregory Marcus--**Let me convey my appreciation for your work on *Looking Back, Thinking Ahead: Strengthening Minnesota's Public-Policy Process*.

Clearly much time and effort went into the work.

I think it adds useful information and advice to the public policy process.

That being said, my concerns with the document stem from the report having an impression of people and organizations that is not completely in keeping with reality. At various places the report states:

“Members of Minnesota’s philanthropic community already are .... being unaffiliated with interest groups, being nonpartisan...”

I would suggest that Minnesota’s philanthropic foundations look quite like our colleges campuses – and are largely influenced by people who have graduated from them.

“Our academic institutions are continually producing a flood of reliable, scholarly work...”

To which I would suggest reading this:

<http://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/the-lefts-bad-social-science-jonathan-haidt/>

This is not at all to say that Minnesota’s foundations are not and cannot be immensely helpful in making public policy. I am simply saying that ascribing too much good to any one source of power is a mistake and can, ultimately, be very dangerous.

Again, I think you and your colleagues have done good work and I appreciate the report. As to the weaknesses I see in the report, I’d suggest that a remedy is rather more political diversity among foundations and universities. If that cannot be accomplished thru them, then a more equal opportunity and public policy creating power must be granted to other institutions and individuals.

